

REMARKS

By the above actions, the specification and claim 1 have been amended and claim 2 has been canceled. In view of these actions and the following remarks, further consideration of this application is now requested.

Before proceeding further, the undersigned wishes to thank the Examiner for taking the type to explain the basis of his § 112 rejections more fully at a personal interview conducted on November 17, 2004. As a result of these discussions, it is believed that conformance of the specification and claims, i.e., providing literal antecedent basis for the language referred to in the Examiner's rejections, will resolve the issues under § 112, and that the prior art rejection that was made "as best understood" will be resolved as a result, as well.


In particular, at the interview, it was demonstrated to the Examiner by reference to various paragraphs of the specification how every aspect of the claims is fully disclosed. However, the Examiner indicated that, while he recognized this fact, because the same language was not used in both the specification and claims, he believed that it was difficult for one reading the claims to know what aspects disclosed in the specification were being referred to. The Examiner then suggested that the outstanding issues should be resolvable simply by conforming the specification and claims through the use of consistent term in both, which has now been done by amending the specification to conform with the language of the claims, and by referencing where this structure is shown in Fig. 5. Therefore, it is submitted that the rejections based on § 112, first and second paragraphs should be withdrawn and such action is now requested.

Likewise, with regard to the rejection of the claims have under § 102 as being anticipated by the disclosure of the German patent application of Patz, as noted in applicant's preceding response, this reference bears no relationship to the present invention for the reasons set forth in detail in the preceding response and which are hereby incorporated by reference. However, as noted above, it is understood from the discussions with the Examiner, that, with the revisions of the type made above, the "as best understood" rejection based on Patz would no longer be maintained. Thus, withdrawal of this rejection is hereby requested.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise, which could be eliminated through discussions with applicant's representative, then the Examiner is

invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order that the further prosecution of this application can thereby be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
David S. Safran
Registration No. 27,997

NIXON PEABODY LLP
401 9th Street, N.W.
Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128

Telephone: (703) 827-8094

W619586.1